



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/649,904 | 08/26/2003 | William T. Harrell | WH-008 | 5749 |
| 7590 | 08/23/2005 | | EXAMINER SAWHNEY, HARGOBIND S | |
| Roy E. Williams 1025 Crosswinds Cove Collierville, TN 38017 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2875 | |
| DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,904

Applicant(s)

HARRELL ET AL.

Examiner

Hargobind S. Sawhney

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 36-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-25, 27-33, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 9, 26, 34 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on June 14, 2005 has been entered. Accordingly:
 - Claims 1-3, 16, 18, 22-29 and 32 have been amended; and
 - New Claims 34-40 have been added.
2. Based on further examination, the indicated allowability of Claim 30 is withdrawn the rejection of the Claim 30 is included in this non-final office action.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-22, 34 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 4, "an outer surface" should be rephrased as --a container receptacle outer surface --, so that it could be distinguished from -- an outer surface-- recited in line 2 of Claim 34. In addition, the limitation "an outer surface" recited in line 2 of Claim 34 should be rephrased as --a cap outer surface --. The above-suggested measures would make the limitations clear and definite.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-22, 34 and 35 are necessarily objected because of their dependency on the objected base Claim 1.

Claims 1 and 34, and all other dependent claims have been examined considering:

Claim 1, line 4, "an outer surface" as --a container receptacle outer surface --;
and

Claim 34, line 2, an outer surface” as --a cap outer surface --.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476) hereinafter referred as Wolf.

Wolf discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

- a container receptacle 2 having an outer wall with an outer surface (Figure 1); the container receptacle 2 coupling to the base 1, and the container receptacle 2 including illuminating means 4 for illuminating the outer surface of the container receptacle 2 (Figure 1, column 1, lines 59-62 and column 2, lines 1-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-6, 10, 12, 23,24, 27-30, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) hereinafter referred as Dubinin.

8. Claims 1-6, 10, 12, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) hereinafter referred as Dubinin.

Regarding claims 1 and 30, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

- a container receptacle 1 having a wall – a transparent wall – having an outer surface (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- a container cap 2, removably coupled to the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- an illumination source 4 at least partially enclosed within the container cap 2 (Figure 1, English translated abstract) producing light beams.

Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus having transparent wall with inner and outer surfaces. However, Dubinin does not specifically disclose the illumination source directing light beams to the outer surface.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to realize that a transparent container wall would receive light beams, from the light source, directed on both outer as well as inner surfaces.

Regarding Claims 2-6, 10 and 12, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus further comprising;

- the container cap 2 including means- external surface frictionally engaged with inner wall surface of the container receptacle— removably attached to the container receptacle (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the container cap 2 including means- frictional fit with the outer wall surface of the container receptacle (Figure 1) – removable attachment to a supplied conventional container cap 7; the supplied conventional cap 7 removably attached to the container receptacle 1(Figure 1, English translated abstract),
- a container cap insert 8 attached to the container cap 7 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the downward movement of the container cap insert cover 8 allowing the illuminating source 4 to be energized (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the container cap 7 including a switch 5 for energize the illuminating means 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the container cap 7 including an energy source – Batteries - for energizes the illuminating means 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract).

Regarding Claim 23, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

- a container receptacle 1 having a wall – a transparent wall – having an outer surface (Figure 1, English translated abstract);

Art Unit: 2875

- a housing means 2, removably couplable to the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract); and the housing means including an output opening 3 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- an illumination source 4 within the housing means 2 (Figure 1, English translated abstract) for illuminating the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- a controlling means 7 – combination of elements 5 and 7 – within the housing means 2 (Figure 1, English translated abstract)

Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus having transparent wall with inner and outer surfaces. However, Dubinin does not specifically disclose the illumination source directing light beams to the outer surface.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to realize that a transparent container wall would receive light beams, from the light source, directed on both outer as well as inner surfaces.

Regarding claims 24 and 39, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) further comprising:

- the housing means 2 including a means- external surface frictionally engaged with inner wall surface of the container receptacle– removably attached to the container receptacle (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the container cap 2 including means- frictional fit with the outer wall surface of the container receptacle (Figure 1) – removable attachment to

a supplied conventional container cap 7; the supplied conventional cap 7 removably attached to the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract); and

- the illumination means including an incandescent light source (Figure 1, English translated abstract).

Regarding claims 27-29, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) further comprising:

- Illumination means 2, the combination including elements 2, 4, 7 and 8, coupled to the container receptacle 1, and the container receptacle having a transparent wall with inner and outer surfaces (English translated abstract); the illumination means 2 illuminating outer and inner surfaces of transparent wall of the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1)
- an illumination means 2 being a cap removably coupled to the container receptacle 1; and the cap including activatable illumination source 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- the illuminating means 2 being a base- the combination including elements 2, 4, 7 and the combination including elements 2, 4, 7 and 8, being considered as a base – removably coupled to the container receptacle 1; Note: the phrase “base” depends on the orientation of the container receptacle; and
- the base – illumination means 2 - including activatable illumination source 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract).

Regarding Claim 40, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) further comprising:

- a container receptacle 1 having a wall – a transparent wall – having an outer surface (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- a supplied conventional cap 7 removably attached to the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- a container cap 2, removably coupled to the container receptacle 1 (Figure 1, English translated abstract); and
- an illumination source 4 at least partially enclosed within the container cap 2 (Figure 1, English translated abstract) producing light beams.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin, in view of Ratcliffe et al. (US Patent No.: 5,785,407).

Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including at least one illuminating mean actuated with a switch. However, Dubinin does not specifically teach the switch being equipped with a timer for putting the illuminating means on actuation for a pre-set period of time.

On the other hand, Ratcliffe et al. ('407) discloses an illuminable container 100 (Figure 7) including an illuminating means 66 actuated with a switch 58 operationally coupled to a timing circuit 80 – timer - (Figures 6 and 7, column 3, lines 51-55).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing the timer-switch

circuitry as taught by Ratcliffe et al. ('407) for benefit and advantage of energy saving during the operation of the device.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin.

Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including at least one incandescent illuminating mean. However, Dubinin does not specifically teach the illuminating means being light emitting diode (LED).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing LEDs well known in the art for their high energy efficiency, compactness and considerably long operational life.

11. Claims 13, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin in view of Masaki (US Patent No.; 4,736,138).

Regarding Claim 13, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including a container cap receiving a controller – switch - activating an illuminating means.

However, Dubinin does not teach an illuminating apparatus having a controller with an electrical current limiting means for limiting an electrical current.

On the other hand, Masaki ('138) discloses an apparatus (Figure 1) for limiting surge currents in DC- illuminated incandescent lamp, the apparatus comprising an

electrical current limiting resister R_4 connected in series to the incandescent lamp L (Figure 1, column 2, lines 14-17).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing he current limiting means as taught by Masaki ('138) for benefit and advantage of limiting a surge current across the lamp filament of an incandescent lamp, and thus extending its operational life.

Regarding Claim 14, Dubinin in view of Masaki ('138) discloses an apparatus (Figure 1) including current limiting means R_4 , which operationally varies the brightness of the illuminating means by varying the current supply.

Regarding Claim 25, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising;

- an electrical energy means – Batteries - for energize the illuminating means 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);
- an electrical switching means 5 for energize the illuminating means 4 (Figure 1, English translated abstract);

However, Dubinin does not teach an illuminating apparatus having a controller with an electrical current limiting means for limiting an electrical current.

On the other hand, Masaki ('138) discloses an apparatus (Figure 1) for limiting surge currents in DC- illuminated incandescent lamp, the apparatus comprising an electrical current limiting resister R_4 connected in series to the incandescent lamp L (Figure 1, column 2, lines 14-17).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing he current limiting means as taught by Masaki ('138) for benefit and advantage of limiting a surge current across the lamp filament of an incandescent lamp, and thus extending its operational life.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin in view of Masaki (US Patent No.; 4,736,138) as applied to Claim 13 above, and further in view of Wood (US Patent No.: 4,736,138).

Dubinin in view of Masaki ('138) discloses an illuminating apparatus having a controller with an electrical current limiting means.

However, neither combined nor individual teaching of Dubinin and Masaki ('138) does not teach specifically discloses the use of potentiometer for limiting current supply.

On the other hand, Wood ('991) discloses a lamp 10 operationally coupled to a potentiometer via a switch 14 (Figure 1, column 3, lines 3-5).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing a potentiometer as the current limiting means as taught by Wood ('991) for benefit and advantage of limiting a surge current across the lamp filament of an incandescent lamp, and thus extending its operational life.

13. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin, in view of Marchese (US Patent No.: 4,072,855).

Regarding Claim 16, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including a container cap receiving at least one illuminating mean actuated with a switch. However, Dubinin does not specifically teach the container cap including at least one surface directing the light beams from the illuminating means.

On the other hand, Marchese ('855) discloses an illuminable container 13 (Figure 7) including an illuminating means 11 received in a base of a cap shape, and a surface 12 directing the light beams from the illuminating means 11 (Figure 1, column 1, line 68 and column 2, lines 1-3).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing the light-directing surface as taught by Marchese ('855) for benefit and advantage of high light reflection efficiency and brighter displays.

Regarding Claim 17, Dubinin in view of Marchese ('855) discloses an illuminating apparatus including the light-directing surface being coated with reflective coating (Marchese, Figure 1, column 2, lines 1-3).

14. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin, in view of Hoy et al. (US Patent No.: 6,511,196 B1).

Regarding Claim 18, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including a container cap receiving a conventional incandescent illuminating mean actuated with a switch. However, Dubinin does not specifically teach the container cap including a printed circuit board containing at least one light source mounted on the printed circuit board, and emitting a plurality of light beams towards the container labels.

On the other hand, Hoy et al. ('196 B1) discloses an illuminating containers 10 and 20(Figures 1 and 2), including a base 64 receiving a printed circuit board 62 bearing a plurality of illuminating means (LEDs) 60 emitting light beams towards the container label 49 (Figures 1 and 2, column 9, lines 40-45).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by replacing the conventional, hard-wired, incandescent illuminating means within the container cap, with LEDs mounted on a circuit board as taught by Hoy et al. ('196 B1) for the advantages of compactness, long operational life, high energy efficiency and cost effective replacement of parts.

15. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1), hereinafter referred as Dubinin, in view of Zelensky et al. (US Patent No.: 5,178,450) hereinafter referred as Zelensky.

Regarding Claim 19, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising including a container cap receiving at least one illuminating mean actuated

with a switch. However, Dubinin does not specifically teach the container cap including at least one light-filter.

On the other hand, Zelensky discloses an illuminating jar 10 (Figures 1 and 2), including a light-filter 38 (Figures 1 and 2, column 2, lines 62, 67 and 68, and column 3, lines 1-4).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the illuminating apparatus of Dubinin by providing the light-filter as taught by Marchese ('855) for benefit and advantage of rendering colorful novelty for displays.

Regarding Claims 20-22, Dubinin in view of Zelensky discloses an illuminating apparatus including:

- the light filter 38 changing the color of the light beams from the illuminating means (Zelensky, Figures 1 and 2, column 3, lines 1-4);
- the color-filter 38 diffusing the light beams from the illuminating means (Zelensky, Figures 1 and 2, column 2, lines 62, 67 and 68 and column 3, lines 1-4); and
- the color filter 38 being semi-circular (Zelensky, Figures 1 and 2, column 3, lines 1-4), and thus directing and focusing the light beams onto the container labels (Dubinin, Figure 1, English translated abstract).

16. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476), hereinafter referred as Wolf, in view of Boutillier (US Patent Application Pub. No.: 2003/00115781 A1) hereinafter referred as Boutillier.

Regarding Claim 32, Wolf discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

- a container receptacle 2 having an outer wall with an outer surface (Figure 1); the container receptacle coupling to the base 1, and the receptacle coupled to an illuminating means 4 for illuminating the outer surface of the container receptacle 2 (Figure 1, column 1, lines 59-62 and column 2, lines 1-11).

However, Wolf does not specifically teach the outer surface of the container having a label. On the other hand, Boutilier discloses a bottle 10 with a label 20 on its outer surface 14 (Figure 3).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the bottle with an illuminating means of Wolf by providing a label as taught by Boutilier benefit and advantage of making the display visible in dark, and increase its ornamental value.

Regarding Claim 33, neither combined nor individual teaching of Wolf and Boutilier specifically teaches the coupling of the illuminating means and a medicine container. On the other hand, Wolf in view of Boutilier discloses an illuminating means illuminating a container other than a medicine container.

It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claim apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitation.

Thus, regarding claims 32 and 33, it would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to meet the method limitations by applying combined teaching, detailed above, of Wolf and Boutilier.

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 8, 9, 26, 34 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record, including Zelensky et al. (US Patent No.: 5,178,450), Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) and Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476), does not show or suggest the applicant's invention as claimed. Specifically, the prior art of record does not disclose an illuminating apparatus combining:

- a container cap including a side-mounted flexible material attached to the cap side as recited in Claim 8;
- a light guide means within the housing means (Cap) for directing light wave to the container label as recited in claims 26 and 34;
- a container cap including an outer surface focusing plurality of light beams to the container label as recited in Claim 35;

Claim 9 is necessarily objected because of its dependency on the objected base Claim 8.

18. Claims 36-38 are allowed

The prior art of record, including, Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) and Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476), does not show or suggest the applicant's invention as claimed. Specifically, the prior art of record does not disclose an illuminating apparatus combining:

- a side mounted flexible membrane material attached to the container cap as recited in Claim 36;

The above-indicated combination, including positioning of the resilient seal-receiving slot, makes this invention unique.

Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) and Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476) each teaches a container having a removably coupled cap having means for illuminating the inner surface. Neither combined nor individual teaching of Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) and Wolf (US Patent No.: 4,836,476) teaches illuminating the outer surface of the container as detailed above.

Therefore, Claim 36 is allowed over prior art.

Claims 37 and 38 are necessarily allowed because of their dependency on the allowable base Claim 36.

Response to Amendment

19. Applicant's arguments filed on June 14, 2005 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejections of claims 1-6, 10, 12, 23, 24, 27-29 and 31, and 35 U.S.C (103(a) rejections of claims 7, 11, 13-22, 25, 32 and 33 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument: Regarding claims 1, 2-7, 10-22 and 27-29, the prior art Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1) does not teach illumination of the outer surface.

Response: As indicated in section 7 above, Dubinin discloses an illuminating apparatus having transparent wall with inner and outer surfaces. However, Dubinin does not specifically disclose the illumination source directing light beams to the outer surface.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to realize that a transparent container wall would receive light beams, from the light source, directed on both outer as well as inner surfaces.

Argument: Regarding claims 23-25, Zelensky et al. (US Patent No.: 5,178,450) does not teach illumination of the outer surface.

Response: As indicated in section 7 above, further examination of the instant application has required rejections of claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dubinin et al. (WO 01/90640 A1).

Because of change in the strategy applied for the rejections of claims 23 and 24, the above-indicated argument is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections.

Argument: Regarding claims 31-33, Wolf ('476) does not teach a separate base with illumination capability.

Response: As indicated in section 5 above, Wolf ('476) discloses an illuminating apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

- a container receptacle 2 having an outer wall with an outer surface (Figure 1); the container receptacle 2 coupling to the detachable base 1, and the container receptacle 2 including illuminating means 4 for illuminating the outer surface of the container receptacle 2 (Figure 1, column 1, lines 59-62 and column 2, lines 1-11).

The above-indicated teaching of Wolf ('476) meets the limitations recited in Claim 31.

Further, replacement of the bottle with a new one would require separation of the base from the bottle.

Argument: Regarding Claim 31, Wolf ('476) does not teach or suggest illumination of other parts of the container mainly body and functional label.

Response: The limitations of the Claim 31 recite specific areas of the outer surface to be illuminated. Further, the container with transparent wall is expected to be illuminated with the reflection of light from the light source.

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the


examiner should be directed to Hargobind S. Sawhney whose telephone number is 571 272 2380. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:15 - 2:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571 272 2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HSS

8/12/2005


Stephen Husar
Primary Examiner